



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,870	02/27/2004	Vadim Fux	555255012558	7232
24325	7590	07/02/2007	EXAMINER	
PATENT GROUP 2N			PATEL, MANGLESH M	
JONES DAY			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NORTH POINT			2178	
901 LAKESIDE AVENUE			MAIL DATE	
CLEVELAND, OH 44114			DELIVERY MODE	
			07/02/2007	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/788,870	FUX ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Manglesh M. Patel	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 and 24-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 and 24-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Final action is responsive to the amendment filed on 4/20/2007.
2. In the Amendment Claims 1-21 & 24-28 are pending. Claims 22-23 are canceled. Claims 1, 10 and 18-19 are independent claims

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-21 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori (U.S. Pub 2002/0087702, filed Dec 29, 2000).

Regarding Independent claims 1, 18, Mori discloses a system for facilitating the processing of font data for electronic data transfers to client devices, comprising: A client font list store comprising a list of client font capabilities associated with one or more client devices (abstract & paragraphs 12-15, wherein the font library includes a font listing and a font image for a client device); and Font processing software stored in a computer readable medium and comprising processor executable instructions that are operable to cause a processing device to receive an electronic data transfer addressed to at least one client device, the at least one client device corresponding to the one or more client devices, determine augment font data by accessing font data in the electronic data transfer and comparing the accessed font data to the list of client font capabilities associated with the one or more client devices, and to include the augment font data in the electronic data transfer to the at least one client device (abstract & paragraphs 12-15 & fig 1B, 1C, wherein the request includes accessing a font library and determining which font image is appropriate for the device). Mori doesn't explicitly define what client device supports what font within the library of fonts. However at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to include a listing of fonts with the appropriate device that supports them. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow display of rich-styled text based on the device capabilities thereby reducing the computational requirements of the client device.

Regarding Dependent claim 2 and 11, Mori discloses wherein the font processing software further comprises processor executable instructions that are operable to cause a processing device to request the list of client font

capabilities from the one or more client devices and store the list of client font capabilities received in response in the client font list store (abstract & paragraphs 12-15 & fig 1B, 1C, wherein the request includes receiving and storing the font images from the font library). Mori doesn't explicitly define what client device supports what font within the library of fonts. However at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to include a listing of fonts with the appropriate device that supports them. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow display of rich-styled text based on the device capabilities thereby reducing the computational requirements of the client device.

Regarding Dependent claim 3 and 12, Mori discloses wherein the one or more client devices comprise mobile communication devices (abstract & paragraphs 12-15 & fig 1B, 1C, wherein the device is a mobile communication device).

Regarding Dependent claim 4 and 13, Mori discloses wherein the electronic data transfer comprises an electronic document (Fig 1A & Fig 3 & See paragraph 10, wherein the transfer includes an electronic document).

Regarding Dependent claim 5 and 14, Mori doesn't explicitly describe the use of a Wireless Access Protocol during the data transfer. However at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to include the use of WAP since it is an open international standard for wireless communications for access to the internet. Further Mori describes in the abstract that it is for a mobile device that has access to a network that includes the Internet. The motivation for doing so would have been able to display a browser based on the restrictions of the client device thereby preventing errors.

Regarding Dependent claim 6 and 16, Mori discloses wherein the list of client font capabilities associated with one or more client devices comprises a list of fonts supported by each of the one or more client devices (fig 3 & paragraph 34, wherein the a library of fonts is accessed by multiple devices). Mori doesn't explicitly define what client device supports what font within the library of fonts. However at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to include a listing of fonts with the appropriate device that supports them. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow display of rich-styled text based on the device capabilities thereby reducing the computational requirements of the client device.

Regarding Dependent claim 7, with dependency of claim 1, Mori discloses wherein the font processing software is

executed on a server computer having stored font data (abstract & paragraphs 12-15 & fig 1B, 1C, wherein the server includes a font library).

Regarding Dependent claim 8, with dependency of claim 7, Mori discloses wherein the font processing software further comprises processor executable instructions that are operable to cause the server computer to request and receive augment font data from an augment font provider if the augment font data is not included in the stored font data (abstract & paragraphs 12-15 & fig 1B, 1C).

Regarding Dependent claim 9, with dependency of claim 1, Mori discloses: A server font data store comprising server font data for a plurality of font types (abstract & paragraphs 12-15 & fig 1B, 1C, wherein the font library includes a plurality of font types); and A provider font list store comprising font provider access data (paragraph 31, wherein the font list includes user identification information); Wherein the processor executable instructions are operable to cause a processing device access the server font data store to obtain augment font data and to access the provider font list store to issue a request to a font provider to obtain augment font data (paragraph 34, wherein the device accesses the server font library and requests the font provider information for obtaining the font data).

Regarding Independent claim 10, Mori discloses a method of facilitating the processing of font data for electronic data transfers to client devices, comprising: Storing a list of client font capabilities associated with one or more client devices (abstract & paragraphs 12-15, wherein the font library includes a font listing and a font image for a client device); Accessing font data in an electronic data transfer addressed to at least one client device, the at least one client device corresponding to the one or more client devices (abstract & paragraphs 12-15 & fig 1B, 1C, wherein the font library data is accessed by the client device); Comparing the accessed font data to the list of client font capabilities associated with the one or more client devices (abstract & paragraphs 12-15 & fig 1B, 1C, wherein the client while accessing the font data includes determining what capabilities are supported for display by the device); Identifying augment font data based on the comparing the accessed font data to the list of client font capabilities associated with the one or more client devices (abstract & paragraphs 12-15 & fig 1B, 1C, wherein the font images is provided to the client device by the analyzer based on its capabilities and frequency of the font characteristics); Including augment font data in the electronic data transfer to the at least one client device (abstract & paragraphs 12-15 & fig 1B, 1C, wherein the requested and supported font is sent to the device). Mori doesn't explicitly define what client device supports what font within the library of fonts. However at the time of the invention it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill to include a listing of fonts with the appropriate device that supports them. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow display of rich-styled text based on the device capabilities thereby reducing the computational requirements of the client device.

Regarding Dependent claim 15, with dependency of claim 12, Mori discloses wherein the electronic data transfer comprises an e-mail message (abstract & paragraphs 12-15 & fig 1B, 1C & paragraph 10).

Regarding Dependent claim 17, with dependency of claim 10, Mori discloses: Determining if the augment font data is stored in a font data store (abstract & paragraphs 12-15 & fig 1B, 1C, wherein accessing the font images for the client device from the library of fonts based on the configuration includes determining if the font data is stored in the font library);

Requesting augment font data from an augment font provider if the augment font data is not stored in the font data store (abstract & paragraphs 12-15 & fig 1B, 1C & paragraph 30, wherein the request from the client device includes access to font data not stored in the font library by updating the software).

Regarding Independent claim 19, Mori discloses a method of facilitating the processing of font data in electronic messages addressed to one or more client devices, comprising: Determining client font capabilities associated with the one or more client devices (abstract & paragraphs 12-15, wherein the font library includes a font listing and a font image for a client device); Receiving an electronic message addressed to at least one client device, the at least one client device corresponding to the one or more client devices (fig 1C, wherein a request to obtain the content or font images from the font library is received); Accessing font data in the electronic message (fig 2, wherein the font data is accessed from the message); Comparing the accessed font data to the client font capabilities associated with the one or more client devices (abstract & paragraphs 12-15 & fig 1B, 1C, wherein the client while accessing the font data includes determining what capabilities are supported for display by the device); Identifying augment font data based on the comparing the accessed font data to the client font capabilities associated with the one or more client devices (abstract & paragraphs 12-15 & fig 1B, 1C, wherein the font images is provided to the client device by the analyzer based on its capabilities and frequency of the font characteristics); Including augment font data in the electronic message addressed to the at least one client device to create a font-augmented electronic message (abstract & paragraphs 12-15 & fig 1B, 1C, wherein the requested and supported font is sent to the device); and Transmitting the font-augmented electronic message to the at least one client device (fig 1c, wherein the font augmented message is

transmitted to the client device). Mori doesn't explicitly define what client device supports what font within the library of fonts. However at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to include a listing of fonts with the appropriate device that supports them. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow display of rich-styled text based on the device capabilities thereby reducing the computational requirements of the client device.

Regarding Dependent claim 20, with dependency of claim 19, Mori discloses wherein the determining client font capabilities associated with one or more client devices comprises receiving a list of client font capabilities from each of the one or more client devices (abstract & paragraphs 12-15, wherein the font library includes a font listing and a font image for a client device). Mori doesn't explicitly define what client device supports what font within the library of fonts. However at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to include a listing of fonts with the appropriate device that supports them. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow display of rich-styled text based on the device capabilities thereby reducing the computational requirements of the client device.

Regarding Dependent claim 21, with dependency of claim 20, Teshima discloses wherein the one or more client devices are mobile communication devices (Abstract, wherein the device is a mobile device).

5. Claims 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang (U.S. 6,073,147, filed Jun 10, 1997) in view of Mori (U.S. Pub 2002/0087702, filed Dec 29, 2000).

Regarding Independent claim 24, A method performed by a server, comprising: (i) storing a font capabilities list for each of multiple client devices, each font capabilities list comprising a list of fonts for which the device has font structure data, the font structure data defining the structure in which text formatted with the respective font is to be rendered; (ii) receiving text data addressed to a designated one of the devices, the text data comprising text and font identifiers, the font identifiers identifying which fonts to use to render the text; (iii) comparing the font identifiers in the text data with the fonts in the capabilities list of the designated device, to determine the font identifiers for which the designated device lacks font structure data; (iv) transferring the lacking font structure data and the text data to the designated device.

Chan teaches a server that stores font data required by specific users (abstract). He teaches that data which describes the characters of a given font may not be stored on all computers (column 1, lines 35-43). The font

structure data or characters of a given font are needed to view the downloaded font. In column 2, lines 15-25 he describes how the remote site determines whether information pertaining to all of the fonts is stored at the remote site. If not then they are downloaded from the font server thereby allowing viewing and printing capabilities. Furthermore he goes on to show font identifiers in fig 4A. Therefore the font server maintains the list of fonts including the font structure associated with them, prior to sending the font data or associated font structure based on the remote site request. In column 4, lines 30-55 he states that the key pair is transmitted from the network node to the font server. The font server determines whether it contains data relating to the font that is identified in the key pair. Hence such determining is the comparing of font identifiers between the font server and device. Although Chan describes comparing identifiers and determination of lacking font structures between a remote site and font server he fails to explicitly teach its application on mobile devices. However Mori teaches the application of obtaining font data from a font library to a client/mobile device (see abstract). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Chan to include font support for mobile devices as taught by Mori. The motivation for doing so would be to allow mobile devices to communicate with a font resource server via a network to obtain appropriate font data to be able to view documents on a limited display device.

Regarding Dependent claim 25, with dependency of claim 24, Chan discloses permanently storing the received font structure data in the client device (column 2, lines 15-25, wherein the font resources are downloaded and therefore permanently stored on the device).

Regarding Dependent claim 26, with dependency of claim 24, the server receives the text data along with attendant font structure data required to render the text data, and, in step iv, the server operatively refrains from transferring the attendant font structure data to the device in response to determining in the comparing step that the device already has the attendant font structure data.

Chan teaches a server that stores font data required by specific users (abstract). He teaches that data which describes the characters of a given font may not be stored on all computers (column 1, lines 35-43). The font structure data or characters of a given font are needed to view the downloaded font. In column 2, lines 15-25 he describes how the remote site determines whether information pertaining to all of the fonts is stored at the remote site. If not then they are downloaded from the font server thereby allowing viewing and printing capabilities. Furthermore he goes on to show font identifiers in fig 4A. Therefore the font server maintains the list of fonts including

the font structure associated with them, prior to sending the font data or associated font structure based on the remote site request. In column 4, lines 30-55 he states that the key pair is transmitted from the network node to the font server. The font server determines whether it contains data relating to the font that is identified in the key pair. Therefore the skilled artisan would realize that data already residing on the device would not be needed or requested from the font server. Hence such determining is the comparing of font identifiers between the font server and device. Although Chan describes comparing identifiers and determination of lacking font structures between a remote site and font server he fails to explicitly teach its application on mobile devices. However Mori teaches the application of obtaining font data from a font library to a client/mobile device (see abstract). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Chan to include font support for mobile devices as taught by Mori. The motivation for doing so would be to allow mobile devices to communicate with a font resource server via a network to obtain appropriate font data to be able to view documents on a limited display device.

Regarding Dependent claim 27, with dependency of claim 24, Chan discloses requesting and receiving the lacking font structure data from a third part server (fig 2, wherein the font server is the third part server that lacking font structure or character data is received).

Regarding Dependent claim 28, with dependency of claim 24, determining whether any of the font identifiers in the received text data that are not found in the font capabilities list of the designated device have equivalent counterparts that are found in the font capabilities list of the designated device.

Chan teaches a server that stores font data required by specific users (abstract). He teaches that data which describes the characters of a given font may not be stored on all computers (column 1, lines 35-43). The font structure data or characters of a given font are needed to view the downloaded font. In column 2, lines 15-25 he describes how the remote site determines whether information pertaining to all of the fonts is stored at the remote site. If not then they are downloaded from the font server thereby allowing viewing and printing capabilities. Furthermore he goes on to show font identifiers in fig 4A. Therefore the font server maintains the list of fonts including the font structure associated with them, prior to sending the font data or associated font structure based on the remote site request. In column 4, lines 30-55 he states that the key pair is transmitted from the network node to the font server. The font server determines whether it contains data relating to the font that is identified in the key pair.

Therefore the skilled artisan would realize that data already residing on the device would not be needed or requested from the font server. Hence such determining is the comparing of font identifiers between the font server and device. Although Chan describes comparing identifiers and determination of lacking font structures between a remote site and font server he fails to explicitly teach its application on mobile devices. However Mori teaches the application of obtaining font data from a font library to a client/mobile device (see abstract). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Chan to include font support for mobile devices as taught by Mori. The motivation for doing so would be to allow mobile devices to communicate with a font resource server via a network to obtain appropriate font data to be able to view documents on a limited display device.

It is noted that any citation [[s]] to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. [[See, MPEP 2123]]

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 4/20/2007 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant Argues: Mori's host terminal assigns fonts to text characters based on "frequency of appearance"—not based on individual client device capabilities as claimed. Mori's host terminal does not even have a stored font capabilities list for a client device as claimed, much less determine augment font data from such lists as claimed. (see pg 7, paragraph 2).

However the examiner respectfully disagrees: Mori obtains font data from a font library furthermore the obtaining includes sending a request to the server. Such request includes device capabilities such as screen width, height, color depth etc. see fig 1 c. Thus the skilled artisan would realize that such request data would compare existing device capabilities to that of the server so that font data could be appropriately displayed.

It is not necessary that the references actually suggest, expressly or in so many words the changes or improvements that applicant has made. The test for combining references is what the references as a whole would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Scheckler*, 168 USPQ 716 (CCPA 1971); *In re McLaughlin* 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971); *In re Young* 159 USPQ 725 (CCPA 1968).

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manglesh M. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W 6 am-3 pm T, TH 6 am-2pm, Fr 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manglesh M. Patel
Patent Examiner
June 20, 2007




CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER